

FW: Conditional Approval of Chemetco Foundry Demolition Plan
Rednour, Erin
to:
Michelle Kerr
07/09/2010 09:20 AM
Show Details



From: Rednour, Erin
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 6:13 PM
To: 'Stone, Bryan'
Subject: RE: Conditional Approval of Chemetco Foundry Demolition Plan

Bryan,
Yes, I think we have answered and/or resolved any of the remaining clarification questions you submitted on June 17th.

This email summarizes the understanding of the IEPA, IAD and the Estate regarding the conditions under which the revised Foundry Demolition Plan (Demo Plan) is approved.

1) IAD, as the Supervising Contractor for the Estate, submitted the Revised Demo Plan for IEPA review on May 6, 2010 (see attached).

Yes

2) IEPA provided IAD and the Estate with a letter conditionally approving the Revised Demo Plan on June 10, 2010 (the "Conditional Approval Letter") (see attached).

Yes

3) IAD, as the Supervising Contractor for the Estate, responded to the Conditional Approval Letter on June 17, 2010 accepting most of the comments on the Revised Demo Plan contained in the Conditional Approval Letter (the "CAL Response") (see attached email). The CAL Response asked six clarifying questions regarding the Conditional Approval Letter.

Yes

4) On June 22, 2010, in a telephone conversation, IEPA agreed with clarifications 1,3,4,5 and 6 of the CAL Response.

Yes, and briefly described below

5) In a June 23, 2010 email exchange (see attached), IEPA agreed to a modification to Current Site Conditions, Section 2.2, paragraph 3 thereby resolving the remaining clarification issue raised in the CAL Response (clarification 2).

Yes, as described in my e-mail of June 23

As long as it proceeds consistent with the items 1 through 5 above, IAD, as the Supervising Contractor for the Estate, understands that it can continue to move forward with demo planning and implementation. However, IAD and the Estate further understand that they must submit a final revised Demo Plan consistent with items 1 through 5 above prior to engaging in active demolition (i.e., moving of MBM or actual tear down of structures).

Yes

1) General: The letter did not contain any comments or proposed changes from IEPA to the ARARs Table 1. Please confirm that there were none.

We did not make any changes to the table itself but may have mentioned items within the body of the conditional approval that could be added to the table, such as within the conditional approval letter in the paragraph on hazardous building materials survey, Section 5.9, paragraph 3. Any leaking and/or damaged PCB ballast will be managed as a special waste and pursuant to TSCA 40 CFR 61.

2) Current Conditions, Section 2.2, paragraph 3: The WAM-related comments state that certain exceptions to the primary requirements are granted so that there would not be a 90 day time limit for MBM being relocated, etc but we save that the definition of WAM set forth in the Interim Order applies to the MBM. Can we modify the conditional approval to state:

Delete the last sentence of the paragraph of the conditional comment revision that begins with "However, Illinois EPA has responded with certain exceptions....." and replace it with: "However IEPA acknowledges that, (1) consistent with the IO, WAM handled in accordance with this approved Demolition Plan satisfies applicable regulatory requirements including, but not limited to, the obligations of paragraph 5.a. of the IO; and (2) certain exceptions to the primary requirements apply to specific WAM comprised of MBM that requires relocation for work to be performed as described under this Demolition Plan, e.g., the 90 day time limit for MBM from the Foundry Building being relocated to the Fines Building."

**Yes, as described in my e-mail of 6-23-10, Current Site Conditions, Section 2.2, paragraph 3
Please revise as follows:**

The IO further stated that MBM are considered to be work affected materials (WAM) defined as "scrubber sludge, slag, MBM, wastes, and substances accumulated on the surface of or within the Facility or Facility assets that are managed, handled, or otherwise dealt with in the performance of work under this IO. Consistent with the IO, the definition of WAM will remain the same for the performance of work under this Demolition Plan. However, Illinois EPA has responded with certain exceptions to specific WAM comprised of MBM that requires relocation for work to be performed under this Demolition Plan, i.e. e.g. the 90 day time limit for MBM from the Foundry building being relocated to the Fines Building.

3) Scope of Work, Section 3.1, paragraph 1, bullet 13: This comment says to insert the reference to the 10-day notification requirement to remove asbestos and universal wastes. We understood the 10-day notice did apply to asbestos abatement and have no objection to adding the comment for that purpose but removal of universal wastes does not require a 10-day notice. Can you confirm this? We will then modify the demolition plan so that it is clear that the 10-day notice requirement only applies to asbestos and not to universal waste.

Yes, the removal of universal waste does not require a 10-day notice. As we

discussed, we will be very interested in the progress of the demo work and expect to communicate frequently to keep apprised of the status.

4) Former Smelter Feedstock, Section 5.4.4, paragraph 1: Regarding the repackaging of former smelter feedstocks currently present in the Foundry Building, the IEPA comment wants acknowledgment that the demolition cannot proceed until those feedstocks are removed from the building. It is possible that these repackaged materials may still be present during demolition preparation activities including building cleaning and limited abatement. We understood that the presence of these repackaged materials would be acceptable during demolition preparation activities, but the repackaged materials must be removed prior to actual structural demolition. Please confirm that these repackaged materials can remain in the building during these preparatory activities but must be removed just prior to commencement of structural demolition.

Yes, the materials can remain during demo cleaning preparation activities, but the structural demo cannot proceed unless these materials are removed. Also, we must be notified prior to relocation of the materials, if this becomes necessary.

5) AAF Decon Area and Sump, Section 5.7, paragraph 2, item 4; and Other Hazardous Materials Collection, Section 5.4.3, paragraph 2: These comments state the citation to 35 ILL Adm. Code 724.101(j) should be added. It appears this reference is to make clear that the bulk of regulations applicable to TSD facilities do not apply to the demolition work and that only the requirements listed in 724.101(j) apply. Because this is a demolition project and not a traditional remediation project, the specific requirements of 724.101(j) are not a perfect fit. However, we agree that applying the following portions of 724.101(j) to the demolition project makes sense and we would to add them as ARARs to Table 1. The specific regulations of this subpart that apply to the demolition activities and will be implemented during the activities are: 724.101(j)(1) through 6, and 724.101(j) 9 through 13. We would also propose to add the citations (35 Ill. Adm Code 721, 722, 723, 728, and 809) listed in the comment regarding Tank House Building Interior Demolition Section 6.7, paragraph 2 to Table 1 as well.

Yes

6) Tank House Building Interior Demolition Section 6.7, paragraph 2: The comment related to the Tank House demolition states that concrete liners must be placed in containers for waste profiling purposes. Please clarify that this statement is referring to the concrete tanks themselves and not the lead (pb) liners. Also, we intend to remove residual scrubber sludge from the concrete tank interiors first, then, after the scrubber sludge present on the underlying floor is vacuumed up, we will remove the liners. Once the liners are removed we will break up the tank. The lead liners will be placed into bins for metal recycling. The concrete debris would then be put into a temporary working pile inside the building and then transferred into the containers or trucks. Once a profile gets generated and is in place with the receiving facility, we would then direct-load concrete debris from the working pile directly into hauling trucks for disposal, and not sample every load for profiling purposes. Please let us know if IEPA concurs with this proposed approach.

Per Chris Cahnovsky, the concrete may be profiled for disposal purposes.

From: Stone, Bryan [mailto:Bryan.Stone@amec.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 12:04 PM

To: Rednour, Erin

Cc: 'Morgan, James L.'; 'Penni S. Livingston'; donsam47@yahoo.com; egstegin@cox.net; jgarcia@chemetcoestate.com; Kerr.Michelle@epamail.epa.gov; Kropid, James; Cahnovsky, Chris; Poplawski, Steven; David Herrera; Larry Hartzell; Eric Watt

Subject: Conditional Approval of Chemetco Foundry Demolition Plan

Erin:

This email summarizes the understanding of the IEPA, IAD and the Estate regarding the

conditions under which the revised Foundry Demolition Plan (Demo Plan) is approved.

- 1) IAD, as the Supervising Contractor for the Estate, submitted the Revised Demo Plan for IEPA review on May 6, 2010 (see attached).
- 2) IEPA provided IAD and the Estate with a letter conditionally approving the Revised Demo Plan on June 10, 2010 (the "Conditional Approval Letter") (see attached).
- 3) IAD, as the Supervising Contractor for the Estate, responded to the Conditional Approval Letter on June 17, 2010 accepting most of the comments on the Revised Demo Plan contained in the Conditional Approval Letter (the "CAL Response") (see attached email). The CAL Response asked six clarifying questions regarding the Conditional Approval Letter.
- 4) On June 22, 2010, in a telephone conversation, IEPA agreed with clarifications 1,3,4,5 and 6 of the CAL Response.
- 5) In a June 23, 2010 email exchange (see attached), IEPA agreed to a modification to Current Site Conditions, Section 2.2, paragraph 3 thereby resolving the remaining clarification issue raised in the CAL Response (clarification 2).

As long as it proceeds consistent with the items 1 through 5 above, IAD, as the Supervising Contractor for the Estate, understands that it can continue to move forward with demo planning and implementation. However, IAD and the Estate further understand that they must submit a final revised Demo Plan consistent with items 1 through 5 above prior to engaging in active demolition (i.e., moving of MBM or actual tear down of structures). It is also IAD and the Estate's understanding, based on Jim Morgan's June 22, 2010 email, that the parties will be moving to modify the Interim Order to provide contribution protection to IAD and the Estate for work performed in accordance with the approved Demo Plan as modified by items 1 through 5 above.

Please confirm that this email accurately confirms IEPA's position on the Demo Plan.

Thanks for your continued attention to this matter.

Bryan Stone, PE
Senior Engineer

AMEC Geomatrix | 510 Superior Avenue, Suite 200 | Newport Beach, CA 92663
949.642.0245(main) | 949.574.7080(direct) | 949.642.4474 (fax) | 949.554.9837(cell) |
bryan.stone@amec.com

The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed.
Its contents (including any attachments) may contain confidential and/or privileged information.
If you are not an intended recipient you must not use, disclose, disseminate, copy or print its contents.
If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete and destroy the message.